

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
10

11 REBECCA WU,

12 Plaintiff,

13 v.

14 BILL MCGUIRE, *et al.*,

15 Defendants.  
16

Case No. 2:24-cv-2827-TLN-JDP (PS)

ORDER

17 Plaintiff has filed a motion seeking electronic filing privileges, and two motions for an  
18 extension of time to file an amended complaint and to merge this case with another case pending  
19 in this district. For the following reasons, I will deny plaintiff's request for electronic filing  
20 privileges and to merge but will grant plaintiff thirty days to file an amended complaint.

21 **Motion for Electronic Filing Privileges**

22 Generally, "any person appearing pro se may not utilize electronic filing except with  
23 permission of the assigned Judge or Magistrate Judge." E.D. Cal. L.R. 133(b)(2). "Requests to  
24 use paper or electronic filing as exceptions from these Rules shall be submitted as stipulations as  
25 provided in L.R. 143 or, if a stipulation cannot be had, as written motions setting out an  
26 explanation of reasons for the exception." E.D. Cal. L.R. 133(b)(3). Plaintiff seeks electronic  
27 filing privileges because she has limited financial resources. ECF No. 8 at 1. However, her  
28

1 motion does not demonstrate good cause to depart from the normal filing procedure for  
2 unrepresented litigants. The motion is denied.

3 **Motions to Merge and for an Extension of Time**

4 Plaintiff has filed two motions to merge this case with *Wu v. Kerestenzis*, 2:24-cv-3353-  
5 DJC-JDP. Plaintiff argues that these cases should be merged because a single trial considering all  
6 of her claims would enhance efficiency. Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 42(a) permits a court to  
7 consolidate actions involving common questions of law or fact. When considering whether to  
8 consolidate actions, courts weigh “the interest of judicial convenience against the potential for  
9 delay, confusion and prejudice caused by consolidation.” *Southwest Marine, Inc., v. Triple A.*  
10 *Mach. Shop, Inc.*, 720 F. Supp. 805, 807 (N.D. Cal. 1989). Here however, because plaintiff has  
11 not filed an operative complaint in this case, I cannot determine whether the actions contain  
12 common questions of law or fact. Accordingly, plaintiff’s motions to merge, ECF Nos. 9 & 10,  
13 are denied with respect to plaintiff’s request to merge. However, good cause appearing,  
14 plaintiff’s requests for additional time to file an amended complaint will be granted.

15 Accordingly, it is hereby ORDERED that:

- 16 1. Plaintiff’s motion for electronic filing privileges, ECF No. 8, is DENIED.  
17 2. Plaintiff’s motions to merge this action, ECF Nos. 9 & 10, are DENIED.  
18 3. Plaintiff’s motions for an extension of time, ECF Nos. 9 & 10, are GRANTED.

19 Plaintiff shall file an amended complaint within thirty days from this order’s issuance. Should  
20 plaintiff fail to file an amended complaint within thirty days, this action may be dismissed for  
21 failure to state a claim, failure to comply with court orders, and failure to prosecute.

22  
23 IT IS SO ORDERED.

24 Dated: November 7, 2025

25   
26 JEREMY D. PETERSON  
27 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE  
28